

VZCZCXYZ0001  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #0175/01 0581249  
ZNY SSSSS ZZH  
O R 271249Z FEB 10  
FM USMISSION GENEVA  
TO RHEFBIM/DIA IMADS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHEHAAA/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0482  
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 0285  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
INFO RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA  
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV 0355  
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW 0359  
RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA 0355

S E C R E T GENEVA 000175

SIPDIS  
DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA  
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24  
CIA FOR WINPAC  
JSCS FOR J5/DDGSA  
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP  
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP  
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP  
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR  
NSC FOR LOOK  
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 2020/02/27  
TAGS: [PARM](#) [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#)  
SUBJECT: SFO-GVA-VIII: MEETING OF THE EXPANDED AD-HOC GROUP, FEBRUARY  
11, 2010 -- CORRECTED COPY

CLASSIFIED BY: Rose E. Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Department  
of State, VCI; REASON: 1.4(B), (D)

[1](#)1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VIII-038.

[1](#)2. (U) Meeting Date: February 11, 2010

Time: 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: Russian Mission, Geneva

-----  
SUMMARY  
-----

[1](#)3. (S) During an Expanded Ad Hoc Group meeting held at the Russian Mission on February 11, the two sides discussed three issues: deployed and non-deployed heavy bombers; conversion of ICBM launchers to launchers of missile defense interceptors; and distinguishing features between ICBM launchers and missile defense interceptor launchers. The Russian side proposed language for a definition for "non-deployed heavy bomber," which included test heavy bombers and heavy bombers located at repair facilities for heavy bombers. They also proposed placing a limit of 15 on the number of non-deployed heavy bombers possessed by each side.

[1](#)4. (S) Converted former ICBM silo launchers being used for missile defense interceptors at Vandenberg Air Force Base (VAFB), was

discussed in relation to paragraph 4 in Article V. The U.S. side provided clarification why the U.S. side used the term "modified". The Russian side raised the possible need for an agreed statement regarding these missile defense interceptor launchers that have already been converted, and stated that distinguishing features for such launchers should be provided and discussed. The U.S. side acknowledged the Russian position, but asked the Russian side to provide its proposal in writing. It was also noted these topics were being discussed at the Head of Delegation (HOD) level. End summary.

15. (S) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Non-deployed Heavy Bombers; Missile Defense and Distinguishing Features; and Other Agreed Statements.

-----  
NON-DEPLOYED HEAVY BOMBERS  
-----

16. (S) Dr. Warner noted the U.S. concept for non-deployed heavy bombers would be to include test heavy bombers, heavy bombers in extended maintenance at repair and production facilities, and heavy bombers awaiting elimination at a conversion or elimination facility. Warner said no official position had been received from the Russian side and asked for their comments.

17. (S) Adm (ret) Kuznetsov provided the Russian-proposed definition for the term "non-deployed heavy bomber." He asserted that a non-deployed heavy bomber is a test heavy bomber and heavy bomber located at a repair facility for heavy bombers. He proposed that the following text be added to Article IV: "Total number of non-deployed heavy bombers shall be 15." He explained that a limit of 15 would allow for 10 test heavy bombers and a maximum of 5 heavy bombers located at repair facilities. Additionally, text would be needed to restrict location of non-deployed bombers to flight test centers and repair facilities, which would not be subject to inspection. Kuznetsov noted the U.S. proposal to include heavy bombers awaiting elimination in this definition. He stated that this approach was not acceptable, but he noted the U.S.-proposed agreed statement regarding heavy bombers at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base was good. Warner said the U.S. side would consider the Russian proposal.

-----  
MISSILE DEFENSE AND DISTINGUISHING FEATURES  
-----

18. (S) Col Ilin, referencing paragraph 4 of Article V of the Treaty, stated that a conversion process for ICBM launchers to missile defense interceptor launchers implied the use of distinguishing features. He cited heavy bomber conversions and SLBM launcher conversions as relevant examples, stating that in both cases distinguishing features were identified. He proposed the two sides discuss the distinguishing features associated with the converted former ICBM launchers now used for missile defense interceptors in the Expanded Ad Hoc Group.

19. (S) Warner replied that missile defense discussions were occurring at the HOD level and that the discussion should remain at that level. Ilin agreed the Expanded Ad Hoc Group should not interfere in the HOD discussion, but that the group could assist the HODs by agreeing on a list of distinguishing features. He also asked why the U.S. utilized the word "modified" in paragraph 4 of Article V and inquired as to the difference between "modified" and

"converted".

¶10. (S) Warner stated the U.S. side was not prepared to discuss distinguishing features at this time, but that the issue would be raised with the U.S. HOD. He noted that anything related to missile defense interceptors should be limited to strategic missile defense systems and not include theater missile defense systems, and asserted that both sides would have systems subject to any provisions placed in the Treaty. Warner explained the term "modified" had been used in discussions on this matter in the Joint Compliance and Inspection Commission (JCIC) under START since the START Treaty placed specific parameters on the use of the term "converted" and these procedures had not been used when the former ICBM silos at VAFB had been converted to house missile defense

interceptors. He acknowledged that the two terms "converted" and "modified," had the same meaning from a common sense perspective.

¶11. (S) Warner noted the U.S. side had provided a one-time offer for the Russian Federation to view a modified launcher of a missile defense interceptor, but the Russian side had rejected that offer. Subsequent exhibition offers were made, but again rejected. He stated such silos were part of the VAFB Space Launch Facility, and therefore, not subject to inspection. He inquired if the Russian side had a proposal for this topic.

¶12. (S) Ilin stated the Russian side proposed solving the issue in paragraph 4 of Article V. Additionally, he said an agreed statement, similar to those used to solve the B-1B problem and the SSGN problem, was needed. Such an agreed statement would allow for the demonstration of procedures used for conversion from an ICBM silo launcher to a missile defense interceptor launcher. Those demonstrations could also be used to confirm that the converted launchers could not be used to launch ICBMs and subsequent Type-2 inspections could be conducted to confirm the United States had not reconverted those launchers.

¶13. (S) Warner replied that the Space Launch Facility at VAFB, where these converted launchers are located, are not subject to inspection. Ilin replied that the base would not be inspected; only the individual launchers would be viewed.

¶14. (S) Ilin stated the Russian side would provide their proposals in writing. The issues to be discussed would be distinguishing features for missile defense interceptor launchers as opposed to the former ICBM silos and an agreed statement on the former ICBM silos at the VAFB Space Launch Facility. Warner recommended that their proposal keep the issues of distinguishing features of the different launchers and between missile defense interceptor missiles and ICBMs separate.

-----  
OTHER AGREED STATEMENTS  
-----

¶15. (S) Ilin inquired if the United States had a response to the Russian-proposed agreed statements for telemetry and for the transfer of D-5 missiles to the United Kingdom (UK). Mr. Elliott replied that the U.S. side had provided the proposed text to Washington for review, but that guidance had not yet been received. He noted that almost all the issues raised in the Russian-proposed

UK transfer agreed statement were already covered in the existing Treaty and Protocol and therefore questioned the need for it. Ilin responded that the Russian side would review the proposed agreed statement and the current texts.

¶16. (U) Documents provided:

-- Russian proposal on language for the term "non-deployed heavy bomber", dated February 11, 2010.

¶17. (U) List of Participants:

UNITED STATES

Dr. Warner  
Mr. Albertson  
Mr. Brown  
Lt Col Comeau  
Mr. Dean  
Mr. Elliott  
Dr. Fraley  
Amb Ries  
LT Sicks (RO)  
Mr. Siemon  
Mr. Taylor  
Ms. Zdravecky  
Ms. Gesse (Int)

RUSSIA

Col Ilin  
Mr. Koshelev  
Adm Kuznetsov  
Mr. Luchaninov  
Mr. Orlov  
Mr. Poznikhir  
Mr. Venetsev  
  
Ms. Komshilova (Int)

¶18. Gottemoeller sends.  
KING